

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, and 16-18 are pending and have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 19-24 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-7, 10-13 and 16-24 are presented and at issue. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regards as their invention. Claim 6 reads *inter alia* “providing a user interface for said deploying said OGSA service, said user interface including a tool for undeploying said OGSA service” and Claim 15 was previously canceled. The Applicants submit that the Examiner intended to reject Claims 7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112 rather than Claims 6 and 15. The Applicants have, therefore, amended Claims 1, 7 and 13 to recite *inter alia* “reconfiguring said OGSA container when said attribute does not match said characteristic to support said OGSA service; **and**

generating an error message when said **reconfiguring of said OSGA container is not possible.**” No new matter was added. Support for the amendment can be found throughout the specification particularly in paragraph [0026]. The amended claims now distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicants regard as their invention. The Applicants submit that the Amendments 1, 7 and 13 are in condition for allowance. The Applicants further submit that Claim 6 remains in condition for allowance and that Claim 15 remains canceled.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 7 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Radhakrishnan (U.S. Patent Number 7,284,054) (hereinafter “Radhakrishnan”) in view of OGSI (an article entitles “Open Grid Services Infrastructure (OGSI)”- Version 1.0) dated June 27, 2003 (hereinafter “OGSI”). Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, 17 were rejected

under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Radhakrishnan in view of OGSI, and further in view of Java (Article entitled “Java Programmer’s Guide”)(hereinafter “Java”). Claims 6, 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Radhakrishnan in view of OGSI, and further in view Wilding-Mcbride (Book entitled “Java Development of PDAs: Building Applications for PocketPC and Palm Devices) (hereinafter “Java PDAs”).

The Examiner states with respect to claims 1, 7 and 13 that Radhakrishnan teaches the feature “reconfiguring said OGSA container when said attribute does not match said characteristic to support said OGSA service” citing column 17, line 61 – column 18, line 26 in support. Radhakrishnan teaches a method and system for “aligning” service containers with system environment needs and also aligning the system and application services to ensure that proper service levels are attained (abstract). The cited reference in Radhakrishnan teaches a method of using container attributes, in combination with historical scenarios, in order to align the resources of the servers to ensure that there is enough capacity to satisfy the projected demand for services (“use container rules that are based on one or more deployment scenarios...to align one or more SSCs 710 - 3 to one or more ASCs 710 - 2 . For instance, following the above example regarding the active sessions monitored during the holiday season of December 20 to January 10...detects when the number of active sessions over a predetermined period of time...exceeds a predetermined threshold level. The exemplary action may be to redefine an SSC 710 - 3 that is supporting the ASC 710 - 2 hosting the service such that it includes more processing capabilities provided by other resources.” Col. 18, lines 6-20). Applicants’ invention describes “**reconfiguring said OGSA container** when said attribute does not match said characteristic to support said OGSA service.” Therefore, in the Applicants’ invention the container is reconfigured in order to run an OGSA service that it previously was not able to run. As would be understood by those of ordinary skill in the art, containers are not servers themselves but are instead run on servers, thus configuring a container is not the same, nor does it make obvious, configuring a server in order to add capacity in anticipation of additional load as taught in Radhakrishnan.

The Examiner further states that Radhakrishnan teaches “generating an error message when said reconfiguring said OSGA container is not possible” citing column 17

lines 30-52 in support. The relevant section of the Examiner's citation states: "during runtime of the service, ASC 710 - 2 and/or SSC 710 - 3 may detect an event based on preprogrammed thresholds, event identifiers, time stamp information, etc. (Step 1210). [and] may generate and provide corresponding event data to database" (col. 17 lines 53-56). The generation of the event data in Radhakrishnan is triggered during the runtime of the service. As would be understood by those of ordinary skill in the art, a service cannot run—and thereby enter the runtime state—until the container, that the service runs in, is configured and the service is started. Therefore the alerts in Radhakrishnan occur after the container has been successfully configured and the service has been started. Radhakrishnan does not, therefore teach or suggest "generating an error message when said reconfiguring said OSGA container is not possible." Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein, Radhakrishnan in view of OGSi does not teach or suggest all of Claims 1, 7 and 13. The Applicants submit that Claims 1, 7 and 13 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

With regard to Claims 5, 11, and 17 the Examiner states that Java teaches "said creating said OGSi instance includes identifying a port of a grid resource to support said OGSi instance" citing page 14, section 10 and page 10 section 5 in support. Java describes starting a server listening on a particular port ("start embedded local hosing environments listening on particular ports" (page 14, section 10) and also references creating a wrapper around a container to expose notification syncs (page 10, section 5.1). Both of these methods discuss ways in which servers, or containers, open up ports as servers ("start embedded local hosing environments listening on particular ports" page 14, section 10, and "a client will have to act as a service itself. To make it easy...we provide a NotificationSinkManager" page 10, section 5.1). Therefore Java teaches setting up server ports. As would be understood by those of ordinary skill in the art, the "identifying a port of a grid resource to support said OGSi instance," as is referenced in the Applicants' claims is a client side activity to connect to a server and not a process of opening up a port to act as a server (see also the Applicants' specification paragraph [0019], "To create an OGSi instance, the administrator provides an OGSi instance name and a port of a server 16 that will serve as an access point for the OGSi instance to users systems"). Therefore Radhakrishnan in view of OGSA and further in view of Java does

not teach or suggest “said creating said OGSI instance includes identifying a port of a grid resource to support said OGSI instance.” Therefore, for at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 5, 11 and 17 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 4, 10 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Radhakrishnan in view of OGSI, and further in view of Java (Article entitled “Java Programmer’s Guide”)(hereinafter “Java”). Java was relied upon for allegedly disclosing a user interface but fails to cure the deficiencies of Radhakrishnan in view of OGSI discussed above with reference to claims 1, 7 and 13. Claim 4 depends from claim 1, claim 10 depends from claim 7 and claim 16 depends from claim 13.

Claims 6, 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable Radhakrishnan in view of OGSI, and further in view Wilding-Mcbride (Book entitled “Java Development of PDAs: Building Applications for PocketPC and Palm Devices) (hereinafter “Java PDAs”). Wilding-McBride was relied upon for allegedly disclosing a tool to undeploy an OGSA service, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Radhakrishnan in view of OGSI discussed above with reference to claims 1, 7 and 13. Claim 6 depends from claim 1, claim 12 depends from claim 7 and claim 18 depends from claim 13.

Claims 19-21 have been newly added in order to better clarify that which the Applicants regard as their invention. New Claims 19-21 recite *inter alia* “said OGSA comprises a plurality of OGSI instances; and each of the plurality of said OGSI instances maintains its own address space.” Support for the claim can be found throughout the Applicants’ specification and figures (e.g. “This enables grid services to be deployed to separate OGSI instances, facilitating a form of application independence (e.g., applications do not share address space)” paragraph [0013]). No new matter was entered. None of the Examiner’s cited references, either alone or in combination, teach or make obvious “said OGSA comprises a plurality of OGSI instances; and each of the plurality of said OGSI instances maintains its own address space.” The Applicants submit that Claims 19-21 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 22-24 have been newly added in order to better clarify that which the Applicants regard as their invention. New Claims 22-24 recite *inter alia* “said establishing of said OGSI instance is facilitated by a wizard.” Support for the new claims

can be found throughout the Applicants' specification and figures (e.g. "the create an instance function is selected from the manage instance window 104, a wizard is launched that requests aspects of the creation of a new OGSi instance" paragraph [0019]). No new matter was entered. None of the Examiner's cited references, either alone or in combination, teach or make obvious "said establishing of said OGSi instance is facilitated by a wizard." The Applicants submit that Claims 22-24 are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is therefore respectfully requested.

If a communication with Applicants' Attorneys would assist in advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned so that any such issues may be promptly resolved.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 09-0463. In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time that is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-identified Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103-3207
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 46429

Date: November 10, 2008